

DRAWINGS

Replacement sheet containing Fig 13, amended as required, is attached

Remarks

Concerning the objection to claim 33, the numbering of claim 34, first instance, has been corrected to 33, as required the examiner.

Concerning the examiner's rejection of claims 16 and 32 under 35 USC 112, although it is not agreed that the term "satisfactory" as used in those claims is so vague and indefinite as to justify rejection, the claims have been amended by substitution of the wording "user approved" as it is implicit in the teaching of the specification that when a user concludes that the communication is satisfactory (and subsequently approves the communication) that the final communication can be issued.

The claims have been amended to specify that the automatic communication is generated from a response template which contains data definitions and conditional criteria - which form "embedded logic rules". The amendments also specify that the content of the communication can be automatically adjusted to reflect the characteristics of the media with which the media is despatched.

Basis for the amendment is found in the specification and drawings as originally filed, for example, the passages on page 25, extending from line 31 to the page end with figure 13 , and on page 26 , lines 21 to 30 with figure 18.

In contending the examiner's rejection of the claims as anticipated by or obvious over the primary reference Harkins, it is pointed that the whole teaching of Harkins is directed to transmission of a *pre-defined* document to preferred communication channels. In other words, the content of the document is fixed or predetermined, regardless of the communication channel. In contrast, as now specified in claims 1, 17 and 34, the content of the automatically generated document can be adjusted automatically to reflect the characteristics of any particular channel.

For example, according to the invention, an HTML version of a document may

say "Please click of the link to see the other documents" whereas a printed version of the same document might say "Please find enclosed the other documents ". The response interface of the claimed invention provides a means by which such document variability can be achieved. This represents a different and distinct approach from the teaching of the Harkins as directed as a whole to *channel* variability.

As the teaching of Harkins, properly considered as a whole, does not disclose or suggest that the content of the automatically generated document can be adjusted automatically to reflect the characteristics of any particular channel but, in contrast, the different and distinct approach of only channel selection with the transmission of a document of predetermined, fixed content thereto, claims 1,17 and 34 and their dependent claims, cannot be considered anticipated or obvious thereover.

As the remaining references US 6195094; US 6826443, and Babel respectively teaches only a splitter bar, a tree rendition of information; and language conversion, the claimed invention cannot be considered obvious thereover in the various combinations with the primary reference suggested by the examiner.

Accordingly, it is believed that the claims define patentably over the referenced art. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

A 3 month extension of the term for reply is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W.J. Usher/

Robert W.J. Usher (Customer 04518, Reg 30923)
212 633 1076